

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X	:	
Rio Tinto plc,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No. 14-cv-3042 (RMB) (AJP)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Vale S.A., Benjamin Steinmetz, BSG	:	
Resources Limited, VBG-Vale BSGR	:	
Limited aka BSG Resources (Guinea) Ltd.	:	
aka BSG Resources Guinée Ltd, BSG	:	
Resources Guinée SARL aka BSG	:	
Resources (Guinea) SARL aka VBG-Vale	:	
BSGR, Frederic Cilins, Mamadie Touré,	:	
and Mahmoud Thiam,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		

PROTECTIVE ANSWER

BSG Resources Limited (“BSGR”) and Benjamin Steinmetz (“Steinmetz”) submit this Protective Answer in accordance with United States Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck’s April 8, 2015 Order (“Order”), and without waiver or prejudice to their affirmative and other defenses, including that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over them. The Order requires all defendants to submit a so-called “Protective Answer” sufficient to allow discovery relating to affirmative defenses to proceed within the schedule set by the Court. See Scheduling Order, dated Jan. 15, 2015 (Docket No. 161); Order, dated Jan. 16, 2015 (Docket No. 163).

BSGR and Steinmetz expressly reserve, and reassert herein, their defense that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over them, as well as all other defenses and objections they have raised in prior pleadings in this Action, including those asserted as a basis to dismiss the Amended Complaint (Docket No. 83) (“Amended Complaint”) in Defendants’ pending joint-motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and (6) (Docket Nos. 178-80, 219-20).

BSGR’s and Steinmetz’s submission of this Protective Answer, as directed by the Court, and in accordance with the Order, is not intended to, and does not constitute a general appearance in this Action.

GENERAL DENIAL

BSGR and Steinmetz deny each and every allegation of unlawful and/or wrongful conduct against them in the Amended Complaint.

SPECIFIC DENIALS

BSGR and Steinmetz **DENY** each and every Paragraph of the Amended Complaint, except **DENY KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION** sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in the following Paragraphs of the Amended Complaint: 3-7, 11, 19, 21(b), 21(c), 22- 26, 30, 33-40, 50, 53-81, 83-86, 91, 92, 94, 96, 98-100, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112-114, 116-118, 122, 124-127, 128(a), 128(b), 128(c), 128(d), 128(e), 129-139, 140(a), 140(b), 140(c), 146, 148, 184, 189, 210, 211, 213, 214, and 229-235.

WHEREFORE, BSGR and Steinmetz respectfully request that each of Rio Tinto's prayers for relief be **DENIED** in their entirety.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

By asserting the following Affirmative Defenses, BSGR and Steinmetz do not intend to suggest that matters designated herein as a "Defense" are not elements of Rio Tinto's *prima facie* case for any of its purported claims, or that they are not matters as to which Rio Tinto bears the burden of proof. These Affirmative Defenses are set forth cumulatively, and in the alternative. Notwithstanding the foregoing, BSGR and Steinmetz state the following Affirmative Defenses:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over BSGR and Steinmetz.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because the Amended Complaint fails to allege facts sufficient to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because the Court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over them.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims are barred under the Act of State Doctrine.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because they are not pled with the requisite particularity.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because Rio Tinto did not sustain any damages as a result of the conduct alleged in the Amended Complaint.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because its alleged damages were not proximately caused by any conduct that Rio Tinto ascribes to BSGR and/or Steinmetz in the Amended Complaint.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because any alleged damages Rio Tinto purports to have incurred were caused solely as a result of its own conduct, or that of another defendant(s) or third-party over whom BSGR and/or Steinmetz do not exercise control.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail because Rio Tinto failed to mitigate any alleged damages it purports to have incurred.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims are barred by pre-existing, intervening or superseding events, factors, occurrences or conditions over which BSGR and/or Steinmetz had and have no control.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's alleged damages are not recoverable from BSGR and/or Steinmetz because they are remote, speculative, contingent and barred as a matter of law.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Any damage, loss or liability sustained by Rio Tinto must be reduced, diminished, and/or barred in proportion to the wrongful or negligent conduct of persons or entities other than BSGR and/or Steinmetz.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail, in whole or in part, on the grounds of laches, estoppel, quasi-estoppel, ratification, acquiescence, waiver and/or other related equitable doctrines.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Rio Tinto's claims fail, in whole or in part, on the grounds of inequitable conduct and unclean hands.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

BSGR and Steinmetz expressly reserve the right to amend and/or supplement this Protective Answer and the Affirmative Defenses alleged herein, including as provided in the Order.

WHEREFORE, BSGR and Steinmetz respectfully seek judgment dismissing the Amended Complaint with prejudice, an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements incurred in connection with this action, and such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: April 29, 2015

MISHCON DE REYA NEW YORK LLP

By: /s/Vincent Filardo, Jr.
Vincent Filardo, Jr.
Timothy J. McCarthy

750 Seventh Avenue, 26th Floor
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (212) 612-3270
Fax: (212) 612-3297
vincent.filardo@mishcon.com
tim.mccarthy@mishcon.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Benjamin Steinmetz
and BSG Resources Limited*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Vincent Filardo, Jr. hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of Defendants BSG Resources Limited and Benjamin Steinmetz's Protective Answer to be served upon the following attorneys of record by ECF filing and Electronic Mail on April 29, 2015:

William A. Burck
Eric C. Lyttle
Michael J. Lyle
Stephen M. Hauss
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP
777 6th Street NW, 11th floor
Washington, DC 20001
williamburck@quinnemanuel.com
ericlyttle@quinnemanuel.com
mikelyle@quinnemanuel.com

Michael B. Carlinsky
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
michaelcarlinsky@quinnemanuel.com

Counsel for Plaintiff Rio Tinto plc

Jonathan I. Blackman
Lewis J. Liman
Boaz S. Morag
Joaquin P. Terceno, III
Matthew M. Karlan
Esti T. Tambay
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
One Liberty Plaza
New York, NY 10006
jblackman@cgsh.com
lliman@cgsh.com
bmorag@cgsh.com
jterceno@cgsh.com
mkarlan@cgsh.com
etambay@cgsh.com

Counsel for Defendant Vale, S.A.

Paul E. Summit
Sullivan & Worcester LLP

One Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
psummit@sandw.com

Nita Kumaraswami
Sullivan & Worcester LLP
1633 Broadway, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
nkumaraswami@sandw.com

Counsel for Defendant Mahmoud Thiam

Martin J. Auerbach
1330 Avenue of the Americas, Suite 1100
New York, New York 10019
auerbach@mjaesq.com

*Counsel for Defendants VBG-Vale BSGR Limited aka BSG Resources (Guinea) Ltd. aka
BSG Resources Guinée Ltd, BSG Resources Guinée SARL aka BSG Resources (Guinea)
SARL aka VBG-Vale BSGR*

Dated: April 29, 2015
New York, New York

/s/Vincent Filardo, Jr.
Vincent Filardo, Jr.